transportation for the passenger's convenience that departs before the payment can be made or if the passenger becomes eligible for denied boarding compensation as a result of being delayed on an extra section of a flight, the payment will be sent to the passenger within 24 hours.

* * * * *

(Secs. 204, 403, 404, 411, Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended; 72 Stat. 743, 758, 760, and 769 (49 U.S.C. 1324, 1373, 1374, and 1381))

By the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Phyllis T. Kaylor

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 80-14107 Filed 5-6-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6320-01-M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 51

[FRL 1486-8; Docket No. A-79-34]

Prevention of Significant Deterioration for Hydrocarbons, Carbon Monoxide, Nitrogen Oxides, Ozone, and Lead (PSD Set II)

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.

ACTION: Advanced notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: Part C Title I of the Clean Air Act requires the prevention of significant deterioration of air quality. Section 163 of this Act provides for the establishment of air quality increments to restrict the maximum allowable increase in ambient concentration of sulfur dioxide and particulate matter (Set I pollutants). Section 166 requires the Administrator to conduct a study and promulgate regulations to prevent significant deterioration resulting from other criteria pollutants. The other criteria pollutants now include hydrocarbons, carbon monoxide, ozone, nitrogen oxides, and lead (Set II pollutants).

EPA proposes to undertake the study mandated by section 166 of the Act and solicits comments on specific issues and aspects related to this contemplated action.

DATE: Comments received on or before July 7, 1980, will be considered by the Environmental Protection Agency.

ADDRESS: Comments should be submitted to: Cental Docket Section (A-130), Environmental Protection Agency, Attn.: Docket No. A-79-34, 401 M Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20460.

Docket No. A-79-34, containing material relevant to this rulemaking, is located in the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Central Docket Section, Room 2903B, 401 M Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. The public may inspect this docket between 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. on weekdays, and a reasonable fee may be charged for copying.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Nancy Mayer, Environmental Protection Agency (MD-15), Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711; phone (919) 541-5497.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The EPA intends to undertake a study and develop regulations in compliance with section 166 of the Clean Air Act. Section 166 requires prevention of significant deterioration of air quality caused by the emission of Set II pollutants. In section 163 of the Act, Congress established air quality increments to restrict the maximum allowable ambient concentration increases of sulfur dioxide and particulate matter (Set I pollutants). These two pollutants are primarily of stationary source origin, are relatively stable, and are generally characterized by more accurate modeling and better data availability than the Set II pollutants. In recognition of these differences, section 166 does not restrict EPA to an increment system for Set II pollutants, but does still require that numerical measures be developed that are at least as effective as the increment system established in section 163 would be. Section 166 further adds that the system developed "may contain air quality increments, emission density requirements, or other measures."

This notice informs interested parties of EPA's intent to begin a process which will result in EPA's and States' plans to prevent the significant deterioration of air quality caused by the emission of Set II pollutants.

EPA is now reviewing a range of regulatory alternatives which appear the most reasonable at this time. Many of these alternatives are obviously more directly applicable to some pollutants than to others. The alternatives currently under consideration include the following:

A. *Emission Controls Only.* This system would rely primarily on the requirements for best available control technology (BACT) on major new stationary sources and the Federal standards for motor vehicle emissions with the possible addition of inspection and maintenance requirements. Control requirements under this system would not vary as a function of ambient concentrations or the proximity of sources so long as the National Ambient Air Quality Standards were not violated.

B. *Ambient Air Quality Increments.* This would call for developing an area classification system establishing numerical limits for allowable ambient air quality degradation. This system would be similar to that already in effect for particulates and sulfur dioxide but not now applicable to Set II pollutants.

C. *Emission Density Zoning (EDZ).* An EDZ system would set theoretical air quality increments to serve as a guideline for establishing maximum allowable emission limits per unit land area. Once these limits were established, emission limits rather than ambient air quality would determine all preconstruction review and enforcement actions under PSD.

D. *Inventory Management.* This system would require State and local agencies to develop and maintain detailed emission inventories, with the provisions for mandatory periodic public review whenever the local emission inventory increased by a preestablished quantity or percentage. This public review would be required prior to allowing any further incremental increase in emissions and could include an environmental analysis, a public education program, a public hearing, and a vote by elected officials from the potentially impacted area.

E. *Statewide Emission Limitation (Bubble).* This system would set areawide emission limitations to insure that there would be no net increases in emissions. This area could be defined as a State, a portion of a State or possibly more than one State. Every local increase (after some fixed time) would require an offsetting decrease somewhere else within the defined area.

F. *Avoidance of Co-located HC and NO_x Sources.* This approach would prevent significant deterioration resulting from the formation of ozone. Such a program would focus special attention on the HC/NO_x ratio and prevent the juxtaposition of HC and NO_x sources within a certain fixed distance of each other.

G. *Emission Fees.* A fee system would strengthen the requirements for BACT on new major stationary sources. A fee levied against each source based on its quantity of emissions would provide the source an incentive to develop and incorporate new technology.

H. *Marketable Permits.* Marketable permits establish a permit to emit a certain fixed quantity of emissions and allow that permit to be bought and sold in the market. Like an emission fee system, the cost of these permits provides an incentive to the source to minimize the quantity of emissions. Furthermore, limiting the number of marketable permits within an area can

regulate the exact quantity of emissions within that area.

I. *"De minimus" Level.* This alternative would not require PSD review in areas that show air quality concentrations and/or emissions below a certain, "de minimus" level. This would eliminate periodic assessments in undeveloped areas.

J. *Transportation BACT.* This alternative would require means to reduce emissions associated with motor vehicle related sources. These means could involve specifications for road systems or performance standards for public transportation systems, such as specified levels of service for public transportation. Additional criteria for existing transportation processes could also be considered.

The issues EPA presently considers important in developing a PSD Set II program include:

A. How should the baseline be defined? What should be the baseline date? What actions would be counted in determining increment consumption? How would the various alternatives affect industrial, commercial and other sources?

B. How can these regulations best protect air quality in pristine areas against significant deterioration in situations where emissions from indirect sources represent the most significant threat?

C. What type of additional control requirements could or should these regulations require for mobile sources? What should be the balance between control of mobile sources versus stationary sources?

D. Given the difficulty of modeling many of the Set II pollutants, what type and level of detail of modeling can or should EPA or a State require?

E. How much preconstruction monitoring should EPA or a State require? How much post-construction monitoring?

F. What size and type of sources should be subject to preconstruction review?

G. What size areas would be most appropriate under an emission density zoning system? Under an increment system?

H. How much consistency should be required between PSD Set II and other programs, specifically, PSD Set I, New Source Review/Nonattainment and Visibility? What is the true extent of attainment vs. nonattainment areas and how will this affect the PSD Set II program?

I. How will class I areas and surrounding areas which impact them best be treated?

J. What level of detail will be most appropriate for Federal regulations promulgated under this program and what degree of flexibility should be left to the States?

K. How should regulations handle increment allocation when an area covers two or more States?

L. What methodologies, other than first-come-first-served, exist for determining increment allocation?

M. How much data are available for rural areas? Which alternatives would only need existing data and which would require substantially more data than are currently available? What degree of accuracy is necessary for rural emission inventories?

Special Analyses

This regulation is classified as significant/major and meets the criteria calling for a full regulatory analysis. All analyses will comply with guidance contained in the May 29, 1979 Federal Register, "Improving Environmental Regulations; Final Report Implementing E. O. 12044."

Public Participation

EPA has traditionally placed a high priority on public participation in the decision-making process and now seeks to expand the opportunity for the public to provide comments during the regulatory development process by holding public meetings prior to proposal.

State and local air pollution programs will receive an opportunity to participate through organizations of State and Territorial Air Pollution Program Administrators and the Association of Local Air Pollution Control Officials (STAPPA and ALAPCO) respectively. EPA also plans to conduct public meetings for review of the proposed rulemaking.

Dated: April 23, 1980.

Douglas M. Costle,

Administrator.

[FR Doc. 80-14077 Filed 5-6-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-01-M

---

40 CFR Part 52

[FRL 1486-6]

Indiana State Implementation Plan; Extension of Comment Period

AGENCY: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA).

ACTION: Proposed rulemaking, notice of extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: The USEPA is giving notice that the comment period for the notice of proposed rulemaking on the Indiana State Implementation Plan (SIP) published March 27, 1980 (45 FR 20432) has been extended from April 28, 1980 to June 27, 1980.

DATE: Comments are now due on or before June 27, 1980.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert Miller, Air Programs Branch, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 230 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 886-6031.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This notice extends the period for submitting comments on the notice published March 27, 1980 (45 FR 20432) proposing rulemaking on revisions to Indiana's SIP. These revisions pertain to the particulate, sulfur dioxide, carbon monoxide, and ozone strategies for nonattainment areas in Indiana. Additionally, the proposal addressed certain general requirements of the Clean Air Act.

The Indiana Air Pollution Control Board on April 8, 1980, requested a 60 day extension of time for filing their comments regarding USWPA's proposed action on the revisions.

USEPA has decided that the extension of the public comment period is appropriate and the comment period is hereby extended to June 27, 1980.

Dated: April 29, 1980.

John McGuire,

Regional Administrator.

[FR Doc. 80-14074 Filed 5-6-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-01-M

---

40 CFR Part 52

[FRL 1465-7]

Proposed Revision of Maryland State Implementation Plan

Correction

In FR Doc. 80-12066, appearing in the issue of Friday, April 18, 1980, at page 26368, make the following correction:

In the chart appearing on page 26369, under the column headed "Current status," the eighth line which reads ".04](1)i(i) and all of .04](1)i(ii) . . ." should read ".04](1)e(i) and all of .04](1)e(ii) . . .

Also, line 16 of the same column, which reads ".04](1)e(i) and all of .04](i)e(ii) . . ." should read ".04](1)i(i) and all of .04](1)i(ii) . . ."

This Correction Notice replaces the one which appeared in the issue of Tuesday, April 29, 1980, on page 28380, in the center column, which was in error.

BILLING CODE 1505-01-M